

A394

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

January 30

The basic industry in Nevada has until recently been agriculture and mining. Of recent years recreation has become one of Nevada's major industries and it is growing. Not content to rely upon this one industry, Nevadans have started a new State program to attract industry to Nevada and it is paying off in new payrolls of hundreds of thousands of dollars. Names such as Rolley, North American, Aerojet, and Sandia grace the State roll of home industries and many others are surveying the State as sites for branch offices and plants.

But what is most important, industry is discovering a political and personal climate created by aggressive, warm, friendly, imaginative, and progressive people. This is the greatest inducement of all, along with a low and limited tax structure. So, within the last 3 years small industries have been locating in both our large and small counties. I do not intend to indicate that we have scored an industrial breakthrough. But we have started, and we must walk before we can run.

The population of the State 10 years ago was approximately 150,000. Today it exceeds the 350,000 mark. Next to Alaska, we are the smallest State in population, but per capita we are the fastest growing State in the Union.

Informed predictions tell us to expect over 500,000 residents in the next 8 years. Of this number, more than 135,000 will be of school age. This would be 25,000 more than the entire population of the State in 1940.

As we daily lay the solid foundations for the future, we can also expect a record prosperity. The personal income of Nevadans, estimated at \$512 million in 1960, should increase to almost \$2 billion by 1970. Tourism, which should bring in about \$660 million this year, is expected to double in the same period.

This, then is a brief picture of Nevada. We are in a period of fantastic boom and we must do everything we can to develop all the resources at our disposal. Being a State with 87 percent of her land owned by the Federal Government, we have attempted to use another very valuable resource at our disposal—the Federal Government.

Along this line, I authorized the creation of a resources council under the direct charge of our State department of conservation. This council, known as the Governor's natural resources council was enacted in November of 1959 and is made up of 14 State agencies and 5 Federal agencies, all working in the field of natural resources. The five agencies are Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, and Indian service.

I cannot stress too much the important work this council has done in the field of better coordination and better operations. It has provided a mechanism to facilitate exchange of information so that each agency can plan its program with full knowledge and better understanding of the related programs of other agencies. The council provides a forum for discussion and clarification of matters of mutual concern. At the present time the council is working out the final details of a proposed State development plan.

Our relations with the Federal agencies has been good. We have made every effort to bring around good working relationship and have made them feel they are a part of our team. I can say that we have found the personnel of these agencies most receptive. This is, we think, important in a public-domain State such as Nevada if we are to develop our natural resources to meet the ever-increasing demands of rapid growth.

Fortune Magazine Article on Cuban Invasion Worth Rereading in Light of Recent Discussion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, after the ill-fated Cuban invasion, Charles J. V. Murphy, the respected and thorough Washington editor of Fortune magazine, did a full scale study of what had taken place and this I placed in the Record of September 20, 1961, A7456-A7460. It is noteworthy that at that time President Kennedy called the article "the most inaccurate" published about the Cuban affair, and although we have all become more used to the heavy handed pressures of the Kennedy administration upon the press, we had not reached the stage of "managed news" that exists now. The Murphy Fortune article was later awarded the best foreign reporting award by the Overseas Press Club of New York—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 16, 1962, page 7829—an organization not exactly noted for being critical of the Kennedy administration. What happened was that honest reporters and editors knew these were the facts and were able at that time to vote as their consciences dictated. Now in a recent interview with President Eisenhower, David Kraslow, of the Chicago Daily News—St. Louis Post-Dispatch service, in an article dated December 23, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, says:

He mentioned favorably an article that appeared last year in Fortune magazine, purporting to give the inside story of what went wrong in the Bay of Pigs planning.

General Eisenhower repeated his praise for this article and its accuracy on CBS-TV during an interview with Walter Cronkite, Wednesday, January 23, as part of the "CBS Report" series. In view of the fact that reliable reports reached me at the time of the original Fortune piece that the White House had sent at least one general and others up to New York to try to suppress this story, and having failed to do so, sought to discredit it, it does seem appropriate for all of us to reread this Fortune article. This is all the more necessary in light of Attorney General Robert Kennedy's interview in U.S. News & World Report this month rewriting history about Cuba. It is to be hoped that the editors of Fortune will continue to report the news as they find it and that efforts to blackball, intimidate, and otherwise harass editors like Mr. Murphy will be stopped. We need a free press and the members of the press need to fight a lot harder for it.

The above-mentioned article follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Dec. 23, 1962]

EISENHOWER ADVOCATES TRUTH OVER MANAGED NEWS POLICY

(By David Kraslow)

GETTYSBURG, Pa., December 22.—Former President Eisenhower believes that truth is a better weapon in the cold war against communism than managed news.

In an exclusive 1-hour interview in his office on the Gettysburg College campus, Eisenhower spoke with feeling on the controversy that erupted in the wake of the Kennedy administration's handling of news in the recent Cuban crisis. He spoke as one who had lived with the problem during 8 years in the White House.

His comments implied criticism of President Kennedy's news policies, but not once did Eisenhower refer by name to Mr. Kennedy or any official in his administration.

However, when Eisenhower wanted to urge more truth and less news management, he chose to turn around a statement made by a Department of Defense official in the Cuban crisis. The statement he chose was the one made by Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. Sylvester admitted that news was used as a weapon in the showdown with the Soviet Union.

Eisenhower had known for several weeks that the interview would deal almost entirely with the news management issue. He was told so in the written request for the interview.

NECESSARY COLORING

We have to recognize, he stressed, that on sensitive international matters governments occasionally have to color or withhold news, but he warned that this can be heady stuff, that such a practice, unless sharply controlled, can easily lead to distortion and manipulation of news for political convenience rather than for national security.

He said that there was some indication of management of news not merely in the interests of national security, but for personal reasons. He did not relate this remark to the Cuban crisis or otherwise explain it.

Eisenhower said that he has no reason to think that the American people have not been told the truth on the Cuban situation, but he noted that he does not know all the facts.

He said that he sees no reason why the administration should not now release a full and official version of what happened in the abortive attempt to invade Cuba in April 1961. The Bay of Pigs invasion is history, he said, and the official story should have been told long ago.

He mentioned favorably an article that appeared last year in Fortune magazine, purporting to give the inside story of what went wrong in the Bay of Pigs planning.

Eisenhower expressed surprise when informed that Mr. Kennedy, at a press conference, branded the article as inaccurate. He said that he was not aware that the President had made such a statement.

A TOUGH QUESTION

If management of news is to be accepted, Eisenhower was asked, how can the people feel assured that the Government is not using this power to conceal mistakes and even scandals?

That, he replied, is a really tough question, one that he wrestled with in the White House. He is not sure that there is a satisfactory answer. He was aware, he said, that he had been criticized severely a number of times for what was called excessive secrecy.

He said that there must be a certain amount of trust in a President and that a

Appendix

Administering a Public-Land State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOWARD W. CANNON

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 30, 1963

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, on December 11 through 13 of 1962, the National Association of Counties held its grazing, water, and revenue conference in Las Vegas, Nev. During the course of the conference, Gov. Grant Sawyer gave an address entitled "Governance of a Federally Owned State." In that address he pointed out some of the difficulties which arise as a result of the high percentage of federally controlled land and some of the efforts being made to facilitate the cooperative agreements that must necessarily be entered into.

His speech gives an interesting and informative résumé of the admission of Nevada to the Union and for these reasons should make interesting reading for Members of the Congress.

During past sessions I have attempted at different times to abate the view held by many people that Nevada was not a good place to hold conventions. In each case where meetings have been scheduled and held these reservations have been eliminated. Consequently, I am pleased that Governor Sawyer chose to begin his remarks by setting out for the record the true facts as they relate to some of these misconceptions.

I ask unanimous consent that Governor Sawyer's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. GRANT SAWYER, OF NEVADA

I would like, at the outset of your gathering, to make an observation: I am most confident that you will find that the facilities and environment for serious deliberation in Las Vegas rank with the best in the world. After all, gentlemen, your meetings take place in the day time. And the dazzle of our entertainment grows brightest after sundown. So, unless you insist upon enjoying all of the sights of this remarkable city, you will find ample opportunity to get down to the business of good government.

But seriously, there has been concern in some quarters about the selection of Las Vegas for no-nonsense conventions.

The highly proper American Medical Association was invited in 1961 to hold its convention in this city. The bid was rejected for an outspoken minority felt the atmosphere was unfit for a serious-minded convention such as theirs.

This year, however, an equally august group, the American Academy of General Practice, held its convention here in Las Vegas. The membership was delighted with the results. The Las Vegas site drew the

largest turnout the academy had ever enjoyed at a convention.

In a letter to the Las Vegas convention director, the executive director of the academy had some words of advice for the other cautious groups. He wrote: "To whatever extent I may have felt originally that we were gambling in selecting Las Vegas, I can only say now that we hit the jackpot. To those other groups who have waited to see how the academy fared, I can give hearty reassurance that Las Vegas can be included in their future schedules with full confidence."

So the American Medical Association also came to Las Vegas, and enjoyed one of the finest conventions of its distinguished existence. AMA's success has been repeated by many other of the Nation's top-ranking organizations. During the first 9 months of this year, 91 convention groups, totaling 89,752 delegates and associates, have been held in our Las Vegas convention center. Our resort hotels, moreover, provide the best in convention facilities.

Las Vegas, then, offers the ideal package for conventions: the proper atmosphere for serious deliberations, and the drawing power of the world's finest entertainment. I am confident you will find this to be a fact during your visit in this city.

The subject of administering a public-land State is perhaps not too different than in States where a large percentage of land is in private ownership. Nevada does, however, point the problem up more than other States because Federal ownership controls all but about 13 percent of the land area of the State.

Before going into some of the statistics of the State, you might be interested in a brief review of some of the early history of Nevada. What is now Nevada was owned by Mexico up to the time of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848 when Mexico ceded to the United States the area covered by the States of California, Nevada, and Utah, the larger part of Arizona, about one-half of New Mexico and small parts of Wyoming and Colorado. This cession, representing about 18 percent of the total area of the United States, cost about \$16 million.

It was in 1846, 2 years previous to the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, that the fatal journey of the Donner party in its attempt to reach California over the Sierra Nevada Mountains a few miles westerly of Reno, took place, and it was in 1847, 1 year later that the Mormon people, led by Brigham Young, arrived in the region adjacent to Great Salt Lake. Some years after arriving in the great basin, Brigham Young and his people began to colonize this little-known region, and in 1849 organized the free and independent State of Deseret. This State embraced a large area extending south from the 42d degree of latitude, which is the northern boundary of California, Nevada, and Utah, to the 33d degree of latitude near the southern Arizona boundary and westerly from the Rocky Mountains to the Sierra Nevada Mountains, and including a section of territory now in southern California, with Salt Lake City as its capital. Congress rejected a memorial asking for recognition as a territorial government. In 1850 California was made a State, the territory of Utah was created, and also the territory of New Mexico. The Utah territory extended from the Rocky Mountains to the California State line and

from the 42d degree of latitude to the 37th degree of latitude.

At that time, what is now Clark County with Las Vegas as its county seat, was in the territory of New Mexico and remained so until it became a part of the territory of Arizona which was created in 1863.

On March 2, 1861, the Territory of Nevada was created and James Nye was appointed Governor of the Territory by Abraham Lincoln. When Governor Nye arrived to take over his duties he brought with him Orlen Clemens as his secretary. Orlen Clemens was accompanied by his secretary, his brother Samuel Clemens, better known by his nom de plume of "Mark Twain," who subsequently related in one of his books that he found out after arriving his job carried no salary.

On October 31, 1864, the Territory of Nevada became a State. Clark County and parts of Lincoln and Nye Counties were not in the State but were still in the Territory of Arizona. In 1866, by a congressional act, this southern boundary of the State was moved 2' southward, which took in Clark County. However, it was provided that this area could not be added to the State without approval by the State legislature, which was not obtained until 1887. History relates that during the legislative deliberations there was some discussion as to whether or not they should add to the State such a barren waste of volcanic rock. Little did the early pioneers visualize the present-day Las Vegas.

Nevada has an area of 70,265,000 acres of which 61 million is owned by the Federal Government. This represents 86.9 percent Federal ownership. Other than Alaska, Nevada has more Federal ownership than any other State. California follows with 45 million acres representing 44.9 percent, then Utah with 36,400,000 acres or 69.1 percent federally owned.

The federally owned land in Nevada is under the jurisdiction of a number of agencies, the major ones being Bureau of Land Management, 47,360,000 acres; Forest Service, 5,058,000 acres; Air Force, 3,331,000 acres; Fish and Wildlife, 2,927,000 acres; and Bureau of Reclamation, 1,160,000 acres.

The 9,240,000 acres not in Federal ownership includes the grants to railroads comprising 5,086,000 acres. The remaining lands in private ownership represent about 6 percent of the State's total area.

In 1867 Nevada, through its legislature, consented to take advantage of the 16- and 36-section grant, but in 1880, also through its legislature, it consented to relinquish the 16 and 36 section grant and to take in lieu thereof 2 million acres to be selected on any part of the surveyed open public domain. Apparently the State at that time felt it necessary to enter into that compromise. The surveys of the public lands were proceeding so slowly and the young State so desperately in need of revenue on which to exist that, at that time, there seemed no alternative.

Nevada received in total grants 2,733,564 acres of land. At this time, in 1962, there are only a few hundred acres of land remaining from the grants in State ownership. Of the 11 Western States, Nevada received by far the smallest acreage in grants. The next lowest was the State of Washington with 3,077,000 acres in grant land. New Mexico received 13,153,000 acres, Arizona 10,589,000 acres, California 8,837,000 acres, Utah 7,550,000 acres.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A395

President should apply a rule of reason consonant with the first amendment's guarantees of a free press.

As a matter of principle, he said, he is against censorship, even in wartime, because he regards it as self-defeating. "We don't want to tell the enemy anything, of course," he noted, "but the important thing is to keep faith with the American people and our heritage. We must not confuse our people and undermine the credibility of our Government."

REGRETS ACTION IN U-2 CASE

Eisenhower then indicated his regret that he did not obey his instincts when Francis Gary Powers and his U-2 reconnaissance plane were shot down over the Soviet Union. His advisers urged him to put out the cover story that had long been prepared to disguise the spying mission in such an eventuality.

His instinct told him to say nothing, he said, but he finally accepted the strong advice of his aids.

Soviet Premier Khrushchev then proved to the world, by producing Powers and photographs of his plane, that the U.S. Government had lied.

Apparently the incident still nettles Eisenhower, and perhaps helps to explain the strong views he expressed on the danger of tampering with a flow of honest news in a free society. It is so easy to misuse power. Government should never fool the people for the sake of fooling the people, he said.

Msgr. Franklyn J. Kennedy and Catholic Herald Citizen Lead Fight Against Racial Prejudice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, America's position in the world today requires that we remove from our shores all traces of prejudice, discrimination, and segregation. One of the most important leaders in this fight is Msgr. Franklyn J. Kennedy, editorial manager of the Catholic Herald Citizen, of Milwaukee.

The Herald Citizen recently covered the National Conference on Religion and Race in Chicago. This conference was attended by 700 Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox, and Jewish leaders from all over the country. I include an article from the Catholic Herald Citizen covering this conference. I also include the final statement which the conference issued, "An Appeal to the Conscience of America." Monsignor Kennedy has said of this document that it "is not only a stirring reminder of the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, it is a call to action":

RACIAL PREJUDICE IS AN INSULT TO GOD; IT MUST GO NOW, CONFERENCE STATES

CHICAGO.—More than 700 representatives of the Nation's major faiths met for 4 days here last week in a National Conference on Religion and Race. Because they agreed unanimously that "racial discrimination and segregation are an insult to God," they issued "An Appeal to the Conscience of the American People."

Catholic, Orthodox, Protestant, and Jewish clergymen confessed that their churches had done little in focusing their peoples' attention on the immorality of racial prejudice. Frequent references were made to the possibilities that if the churches had spoken out in a united voice more than 100 years ago the Civil War might have been avoided.

The conference did more than lament the failure of the churches and issue a statement. It decided to set up 10 pilot projects to provide religious leadership in an attack on racial bias on an interreligious basis. These cities were selected on a regional basis: Chicago, Detroit, New Orleans, Oakland, San Francisco, St. Louis, San Antonio, Seattle, and Pittsburgh. There is a possibility that other cities—including Milwaukee, Washington, and New York—will undertake the project at a later date.

The conference was convened by the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference (its chairman is Archbishop Cousins); the Department of Racial and Cultural Relations of the National Council of Churches; and the Social Action Commission of the Synagogue Council of America.

At the plenary session on Monday evening, Cardinal Meyer was the Catholic spokesman on the subject: "Interracial Justice and Love: Challenge to a Religious America." Archbishop Cousins was chairman of this meeting. In addition to these members of the American hierarchy, there were 2 more archbishops and 19 bishops present. At the various workshops and forums, they shared the platform with rabbis and ministers and lay people from the 68 participating religious groups.

More than one speaker from each of the religious faiths commented publicly that the conference was an outgrowth of the Ecumenical Council called by Pope John XXIII.

Archbishop Cousins said: "He has shown us all the way to work together. In the past, misgivings and misunderstandings have hampered cooperative effort. Now, following our Holy Father's example, we meet as brethren in the fullest Christian sense."

AN APPEAL TO THE CONSCIENCE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

We have met as members of the great Jewish and Christian faiths held by the majority of the American people, to counsel together concerning the tragic fact of racial prejudice, discrimination and segregation in our society. Coming as we do out of various religious backgrounds, each of us has more to say than can be said here. But this statement is what we as religious people are moved to say together.

Racism is our most serious domestic evil. We must eradicate it with all diligence and speed. For this purpose we appeal to the consciences of the American people.

This evil has deep roots; it will not be easily eradicated. While the Declaration of Independence did declare "that all men are created equal" and "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," slavery was permitted for almost a century. Even after the Emancipation Proclamation, compulsory racial segregation and its degrading badge of racial inequality received judicial sanction until our own time.

We rejoice in such recent evidences of greater wisdom and courage in our national life as the Supreme Court decisions against segregation and the heroic, nonviolent protests of thousands of Americans. However, we mourn the fact that patterns of segregation remain entrenched everywhere—north and south, east and west. The spirit and the letter of our laws are mocked and violated.

Our primary concern is for the laws of God. We, Americans of all religious faiths, have been slow to recognize that racial discrimination and segregation are an insult to God, the Giver of human dignity and human rights. Even worse, we all have participated in perpetuating racial discrimination and segregation in civil, political, industrial, social, and private life. And worse still, in our houses of worship, our religious schools, hospitals, welfare institutions, and fraternal organizations we have often failed our own religious commitments. With few exceptions we have evaded the mandates and rejected the promises of the faiths we represent.

We repent our failures and ask the forgiveness of God. We ask also the forgiveness of our brothers, whose rights we have ignored and whose dignity we have offended. We call for a renewed religious conscience on this basically moral evil.

II

Our appeal to the American people is this:

Seek a reign of justice in which voting rights and equal protection of the law will everywhere be enjoyed; public facilities and private ones serving a public purpose will be accessible to all; equal education and cultural opportunities, hiring and promotion, medical and hospital care, open occupancy in housing will be available to all.

Seek a reign of love in which the wounds of past injustices will not be used as excuses for new ones; racial barriers will be eliminated; the stranger will be sought and welcomed; any man will be received as brother—his rights, your rights; his pain, your pain; his prison, your prison.

Seek a reign of courage in which the people of God will make their faith their binding commitment; in which men willingly suffer for justice and love; in which churches and synagogues lead, not follow.

Seek a reign of prayer in which God is praised and worshiped as the Lord of the universe, before whom all racial idols fall, who makes us one family and to whom we are all responsible.

In making this appeal we affirm our common religious commitment to the essential dignity and equality of all men under God. We dedicate ourselves to work together to make this commitment a vital factor in our total life.

We call upon all the American people to work, to pray, and to act courageously in the cause of human equality and dignity while there is still time, to eliminate racism permanently and decisively, to seize the historic opportunity the Lord has given us for healing an ancient rupture in the human family, to do this for the glory of God.

Part 4: Let's Keep the Record Straight— A Selected Chronology of Cuba and Castro, March 12, 1962–September 13, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I now offer part 4 of my chronology of Cuba and Castro, as my continuing effort to refresh the memories of the Congress and of the American people on the course of events taking place between Cuba and the

A396

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

January 30

United States and which now are a part of our modern history.

We find detailed here the desperation of Premier Fidel Castro in his efforts to cope with economic chaos in Cuba. We find the Cuban youth being urged to develop a more intense "Marxist spirit, a more Communist spirit," and their Premier promising them the glories of a "more advanced stage, not socialism, but communism."

Then we find on March 28, 1962, the first U.S. State Department reports of Soviet bloc military aid to Cuba.

We find \$62 million in ransom demanded for Cuban prisoners taken during the abortive uprising of the exiles.

And we find the odd spectacle of President Kennedy announcing that these Cuban prisoners are really a responsibility of the United States because they were "trained and armed for this invasion by the Eisenhower administration" and given the "signal to let them go by the Kennedy administration." However, he states the U.S. Government will not negotiate with Cuba to ransom the prisoners. And the thought occurs to us that the American public then must pick up the pieces and be responsible for Government actions of which they were never really officially informed—and at this late date still have not been—if we analyze the President's thinking correctly. And our thoughts further turn to the four Americans known to be imprisoned in Red China: Hugh F. Redmond, Richard G. Fechteau, John T. Downey, and Bishop James E. Walsh. These men are known to be political hostages and our State Department declares their release and return to this country to be an issue of utmost importance.

We remember, too, the 21 prisoners of war who first refused repatriation after the Korean war was ended. Ten finally became disillusioned with dialectical materialism and returned to this country. One died in Red China. And 10 still remain there.

We think of the 389 American soldiers still officially regarded as missing out of the original figure of 944—and of whom no trace, report, or record has been found—since the Korean war.

And we finally think of the eight American prisoners—one being held in the Soviet Union, three held in the Soviet Zone of Germany, one held in Czechoslovakia, and another still thought to be held in Czechoslovakia.

And we wonder how the families and friends of these American prisoners feel and if perhaps the American public should not be reminded that these men, too, were caught in a Communist trap and deserve to be considered a national responsibility by the public and the American Government.

In this portion of the chronology we find reports of weapons, ammunition, and propaganda in the form of a Communist-authored book on how to wage guerrilla warfare are being sent to nine Latin American countries from Cuba. Then we learn of 20 Soviet ships carrying from 3,000 to 5,000 Communist-bloc techni-

clans, goods and weapons, arriving in Cuba—with an acknowledgement 2 days later by the President that this was indeed true.

This recalls to mind the press conference on November 29, 1961, in which President Kennedy declared that the United States would be "most concerned" if the Castro regime in Cuba attempted to overthrow the existing government in the Dominican Republic or in any other Latin American state. And that prior to the news report of the shipments to Latin American countries of weapons and propaganda, the Guatemalan Government—on March 20, 1962—formally accused Cuba in a note to the Organization of American States of aiding an uprising in Guatemala.

The chronology details our military callup of 150,000 members of the Reserves to active duty and that three of our Republican Senators proposed amendments to the Presidential request for authority for the callup, which would give him added authority to prevent violation of the Monroe Doctrine and to intervene in Cuba, if it became necessary.

The American public, along about this time, was admonished by the President to "keep both their nerve and their heads." This brings to mind Plutarch, who in commenting on a man being praised for his foolhardy bravery, stated:

There is a wide difference between true courage and a mere contempt of life.

And this quotation—in a nutshell—describes the difference in the attitude of a truly republican form of government—and the Communist form of government—toward human life.

The chronology follows:

A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA, MARCH 12 TO OCTOBER 24, 1962, BY THE LEGISLATIVE SERVICE, THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

March 12, 1962: Premier Fidel Castro announces nationwide food and soap rationing to become effective March 19. He links shortages of food and consumer goods to a "brutal economic blockade" against Cuba. He denounces "Yankee imperialism" for making "desperate efforts" to destroy the Cuban revolution. He also says that "we have the shame of not being able to fulfill promises because we made subjective analyses" and because many of Cuba's most skilled workers were either "taken away by imperialism" or "driven away by our mistrust although they could have been won over."

March 14, 1962: Premier Castro (at a University of Havana rally) urges Cuban youth to develop a more intense "Marxist spirit, a more Communist spirit," and says that the young in Cuba will some day live "in another more advanced stage, not socialism, but communism."

March 17, 1962: Premier Castro (in a television broadcast) declares that "the revolution needs to revise all the revolutionary nuclei and all the political apparatus . . . to do away with the errors and abuses and to gain good performance." He singles out those "who think they are more revolutionary than anybody and have the right to mistreat and humiliate others." He also criticizes the watchdog defense committees set up to guard against counterrevolution (which exist in every big city and throughout the countryside) as having committed injustices. "Observers linked Premier Castro's statements to the advancement of

Communist Party assumption of authority in the Castro regime at Havana" (New York Times, Mar. 17, 1962).

March 20, 1962: Guatemala formally accuses Cuba of aiding an uprising in Guatemala: the charge is made in a note to the President of the Council of the Organization of American States.

March 22, 1962: House Government Operations Committee urges the U.S. Government to press a \$99.4 million claim against Cuba for seizure of the Nicaraguan nickel plant in Oriente Province, because the plant had been operated by the U.S. Government.

March 23, 1962: U.N. Security Council rejects by a vote of 7 to 2 a Cuban charge that the Organization of American States violated the U.N. Charter in barring Cuba from the inter-American system. The Security Council also rejects by a vote of 7 to 4 a Cuban request that the question of the legality of the OAS action be submitted to the World Court.

On the same day, Fidel Castro and his brother Raul are named to the two top posts in the Secretariat of the Integrated Revolutionary Organization, the 25-man directorate which is to set up a single political party in Cuba. The Premier is named the organization's first secretary and Armed Forces Minister Raul Castro is named second secretary.

March 26, 1962: Premier Castro (in a radio-television broadcast) denounces Anibal Escalante, a long-time Cuban Communist leader, for having brought "real chaos to all the country" and having "tried to create an apparatus to pursue personal ends." He adds that Escalante has been "separated" and that he had much to do with inspiring a spirit of "sectarianism," leading many to believe that the only ones who could be given important posts "were the old and militant revolutionaries."

March 28, 1962: U.S. State Department issues report of Soviet bloc military aid to Cuba; it estimates that Cuba has received \$100 million of military aid to train several hundred Cuban pilots in Czechoslovakia and provide 50 to 75 MIG jet fighters, and provide modern weapons for Cuba's ground forces of 300,000 men. These weapons include: 150 to 250 heavy and medium tanks, 50 to 100 assault guns, 500 to 1,000 field artillery pieces, 500 to 1,000 antiaircraft artillery guns, 500 mortars, 200,000 small arms, and some patrol vessels and torpedo boats.

March 29, 1962: Government begins trial (at Principe prison, in a suburb of Havana) of 1,182 prisoners captured after the unsuccessful invasion last April.

On the same day, the Council of the Organization of American States votes by 16 to 0, with 3 abstentions, to express a firm hope that the rebel prisoners will have every legal guarantee of their trial.

April 3, 1962: Ecuador severs diplomatic relations with Cuba, and becomes the 15th nation of the Americas to do so.

April 8, 1962: Military tribunal sentences each of the prisoners to 30 years imprisonment, but offers to free them on the payment of a total of \$62 million in ransom. The ransom is set at \$500,000 each for the 3 leaders of the invasion force, \$100,000 for 221 others, and \$50,000 or \$25,000 for the remaining 995 men.

April 11, 1962: Pravda (official newspaper of the Soviet Communist Party) endorses the expulsion of Escalante by Premier Castro for trying to further his personal ambitions.

The Cuban exiles report from Havana that Cuba will release 54 sick and wounded prisoners, in return for ransom payment.

On the same day, President Kennedy (at a news conference) declares that the U.S. Government will not negotiate with Cuba to ransom the prisoners. "[These men] were

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A397

trained and armed for this invasion by the Eisenhower administration. The signal to let them go and the means to get them there were given by the Kennedy administration * * *. Can the U.S. Government * * * wash its hands of them? We think not. Though the idea of bartering with Castro for human lives is deeply repulsive, the United States still has a responsibility for those lives."

April 28, 1962: Premier Castro demands that the committee pay the \$2.5 million ransom within 1 week; if not, he states that the remaining prisoners will be sent to the Isle of Pines to begin serving terms of 30 years imprisonment.

May 14, 1962: Tass (Soviet news agency) reports that the Soviet-Cuban trade agreement for 1962 is to be increased to about \$750 million under an agreement signed in Moscow, a level of trade almost 40 percent higher than in 1961. The supplementary agreement calls for the supply of considerable quantities of wheat, corn, beans, fats, canned meat, and milk.

June 3, 1962: New York Herald Tribune states that President Kennedy has been given an intelligence report of clandestine movements of rifles, automatic weapons and ammunition from four dispersal centers in Cuba to nine Latin American countries: Nicaragua, Honduras, Venezuela, Brazil, Colombia, Peru, Ecuador, Paraguay and Bolivia. The report asserts that the arms have been accompanied by hundreds of copies of Maj. Ernesto Guevara's book, "Guerrilla Warfare."

June 16, 1962: Government parades tanks, troops, and artillery through the streets of Cardenas, a port 90 miles east of Havana, in response to popular demonstrations over food scarcities. President Osvaldo Dorticos Torrado denounces (at a political rally in Cardenas) "wretched counterrevolutionary provocations."

July 26, 1962: Premier Castro (in a speech at a celebration in Santiago de Cuba of the 9th anniversary of his 26th of July Movement) declares that President Kennedy "is set on launching an attack against our country." He announces to thousands of workers that rationing will be extended from food to shoes and clothing.

August 6, 1962: James Donovan, the U.S. lawyer representing the Cuban Families Committee, announces the opening of a public drive to raise the \$62 million ransom required to free the 1,180 Cuban rebel prisoners. (Donovan is the American who arranged for the exchange of U-2 pilot Francis Gary Powers for convicted Soviet spy Rudolf Abel.)

August 20, 1962: Press reports state that between July 27 and July 31, 20 Soviet ships arrived at 4 ports in Cuba—3,000 to 5,000 Communist-bloc technicians and large quantities of goods and weapons are said to have been landed. "The equipment may include ground-to-air missiles, largely defense weapons. There apparently is transportation, electrical and construction equipment, radar vans and mobile generators. These appear to be going into coastal and air defense."

August 22, 1962: President Kennedy acknowledges, at a press conference, that Communist "supplies and technicians of rather intensive quantity in recent weeks" have been landing in Cuba.

August 24, 1962: Several buildings in Havana are damaged by shellfire from two small powerboats sent from Miami by the Student Revolutionary Directory, an exile group of former University of Havana students. The U.S. State Department states that the U.S. Government was not involved in the raid and had no prior knowledge of it.

August 28, 1962: Tass, the Soviet press agency, reports that the volume of shipments from the Soviet Union to Cuba in 1962 will be double that of 1961, and that 10 Soviet ships and 5 ships of West German, Norwegian, Greek and Italian registry are on the way to Cuba.

August 29, 1962: President Kennedy (at a press conference) states that United States has no intention of invading Cuba "at this time." He adds that "the words do not have some secondary meaning. I think it would be a mistake to invade Cuba." He declares that the United States has already been in consultation with NATO nations whose shipping firms have chartered vessels to the Soviet Union to haul military goods to Cuba. "Even to consider [blockade or invasion] as possibilities requires far greater Latin American sympathy for Washington's attitude than now exists."

August 31, 1962: U.S. Navy plane on a training flight over international waters near Cuba is fired on by two naval vessels. The White House announces that the ships are believed to be Cuban, and that U.S. aircraft and ships have been authorized to use "all means necessary" to protect themselves against any similar attack in the future.

September 2, 1962: Soviet Union announces (in a communique issued on the talks between Minister of Industries Ernesto Guevara and Premier Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders) that it has agreed to supply arms to Cuba and to provide specialists to train Cuba's armed forces. The communique states that the arms are intended to meet the "threats" of "aggressive imperialist quarters," a watershed in hemispheric history. It was a power move in the cold war by the Soviet Union, as if a pawn had been advanced on a global chessboard. It was also a daring and defiant gambit by Premier Castro to strengthen his regime and his revolution. Cuba now cannot be invaded * * * without killing Russians. The added dangers of an invasion are clear. Far more than Cuba and Fidel Castro are involved. The wrecked Cuban economy will take a long time to rebuild—4 or 5 years at least, if the revolution lasts that long * * *. No direct move on our part could succeed unless the other Latin American powers went along with us.

"It took 50 years to create the OAS, and only the most extreme emergency would justify breaking it up" (New York Times, Sept. 9, 1962).

On the same day, a U.S. State Department spokesman declares that the Moscow announcement "merely confirms what has been going on in recent months."

September 4, 1962: President Kennedy declares (in a statement issued after consultation with congressional leaders) that the United States would use "whatever means may be necessary" to prevent Cuba from exporting "its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force" against "any part of the Western Hemisphere." The President adds that "there is no evidence of any organized combat force from any Soviet-bloc country: of military bases provided to Russia * * * of the presence of offensive ground-to-ground missiles * * *. Were it to be otherwise the gravest issues would arise." He states that the Cuban question must be dealt with as part of the worldwide Communist challenge and in the context of the "special relationships which have characterized the inter-American system."

On the same day, the Latin American Free Trade Association (in its second conference in Mexico City of the nine members who have signed the association's charter so far) votes by 7 to 0, with Mexico and Brazil abstaining over juridical procedure, to reject Cuba's application for membership of the association, declaring that a Communist economy is incompatible with the market principles of free enterprise and free competition.

September 5, 1962: U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk holds a meeting with 19 Latin American Ambassadors in Washington and informs them of the U.S. determination to prevent the export of communism from Cuba. Press reports state that there was "full unanimity" with President Kennedy's "containment policy" that the United States

would use "whatever means may be necessary" to prevent aggression by Cuba against any part of the Western Hemisphere.

September 7, 1962: President Kennedy asks Congress for authority to order 150,000 members of the military Reserves to active duty for a year, if necessary, "to permit prompt and effective responses * * * to challenge * * * in any part of the free world."

September 11, 1962: Soviet Union (in a statement issued by Tass, Soviet press agency) warns that any attack by the United States on Cuba or upon Soviet ships bound for Cuba would mean war. It asserts that Soviet arms in Cuba are for defensive purposes only. It adds that the Soviet Defense Ministry is taking "all measures to raise our armed forces to peak military preparedness."

On the same day, Premier Castro (in a speech to an educators' convention in Havana) declares that the United States is "playing with fire and with war," and adds that "we do not want imperialism to commit suicide on our coast."

Also on the same day, the Havana radio reports that a "pirate vessel" entered a harbor in north-central Cuba and fired more than 60 shots into a British freighter and a Cuban ship. An exile organization in Miami known as Alpha 66 acknowledges responsibility for the attack.

September 12, 1962: Three Republican Senators propose amendments to President Kennedy's reserve mobilization bill that would authorize the President to take "such action as is necessary" to prevent violation of the Monroe Doctrine and to intervene in Cuba.

On the same day, Moscow newspapers publish the statement of the Soviet Government warning of war if the United States interferes with Cuba.

The effect on Soviet policy of the Russian people's reactions toward Cuba: "There is considerable sympathy for the Cubans among the Russian people. However, there was an adverse public reaction in July 1960, when Premier Khrushchev implied that Soviet rockets would be launched if the United States attacked Cuba. The Premier later qualified this remark as symbolic. Experienced Western observers [in Moscow] believe that a large section of Soviet public opinion will feel unhappy about Soviet involvement in the Caribbean. Fear of war is often the dominant motivating factor in the reaction of the Soviet people to international crises. The defensive tone of the Soviet statement in describing the nature of military aid to Cuba lent support to this theory * * *. Mr. Khrushchev has barred world wars and * * * 'imperialist local wars' as instruments of policy * * *. However, he has appended two stipulations to this rule, both of which fit the case of Cuba * * *. First, Communists must support without reservation wars of 'national liberation.' Then, once such a war has been consolidated internally, as in the instance of the Castro revolution, it must be shielded by the Soviet Union under the slogan 'no export of counterrevolution.' In the Soviet statement this thesis was translated into the warning to the United States * * *. Western observers interpreted [the Soviet warning to the United States] as an indication that Soviet leaders were worried over the possibility that the United States might confront them with the necessity of intervening militarily in the Caribbean or retreating from their doctrine of 'no export of counterrevolution.' They believe that Premier Khrushchev, well aware of the attitude of his people, will go to great lengths to avoid a conflict with the United States. But few were willing to predict what the Soviet leader would do if a [rebel] motorboat * * * suddenly put a torpedo into a Soviet ship in Caribbean waters." (Seymour Topping, New York Times, Sept. 13, 1962.)

September 13, 1962: President Kennedy asserts (at his weekly news conference) that

A398

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

January 30

the United States would move swiftly against Cuba if the military buildup there threatened U.S. security in any way, "including our base at Guantanamo, our passage to the Panama Canal, our missile and space activities at Cape Canaveral, or the lives of American citizens in this country, or if Cuba should ever attempt to export its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force against any nation in this hemisphere, or become an offensive military base of significant capacity for the Soviet Union." He says that if the United States should ever find it necessary to take military action against the Castro regime, the Communist-supplied weapons and technicians "would not change the result or significantly extend the time required to achieve the result." The President adds that the Cuban economy is crumbling as a result of Premier Castro's "own monumental economic mismanagement" and the economic boycott by the United States. He criticizes loose talk in the United States which serves "to give a thin color of legitimacy to the Communist pretense that such a threat [of an American invasion] exists." He expresses the hope that "the American people, defending as we do so much of the free world, will in this nuclear age, keep both their nerve and their heads."

Cuban GI Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OFHON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks, I am including a letter which was sent to the President of the United States, by two Senators and me.

I feel that this letter from one of my constituents echoes the belief of many people in this country in regard to the conscience money which is being spent as a result of the Cuban fiasco.

The letter follows:

LOUISVILLE, KY., January 28, 1963.

His Excellency, JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The President of the United States.
Hon. THRUSTON MORTON,
U.S. Senator.

Hon. JOHN S. COOPER,
U.S. Senator.
Hon. GENE SNYDER,
U.S. Representative.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT AND SIRS: Enclosed is an article from our local paper, the Louisville Times, dated January 26, 1963. The title of the article, "Cuban GI Bill Due," is enough to make George Washington and the rest of this country's great past leaders turn over in their graves. Since when does the Government of the United States give veterans of other countries college and vocational training when it doesn't even give it to its own veterans who pay the taxes for such things. I am referring to the GI bill which was killed by Congress for the veterans of the cold war not so long ago. I ask you to tell me that these Cubans deserve such rights when Americans don't.

I spent 4 years on active duty and over a year in the Active Reserve. I received nothing for my time except the satisfaction that I was doing my duty for my country. I ask nothing in return as I feel I have been receiving my reward in the form of freedom that I enjoy every day. Thousands upon

thousands of other men did the same. Why all of a sudden do we now have to give such rewards to the veterans of the Cuban invasion. They are not citizens of the United States and they were not fighting for the United States. Why do we have to reward the Cubans, we did not reward the Chinese when they were driven from the mainland, nor many others.

Why, if the U.S. Government wants to educate someone, doesn't it retrain the coal miners who are fast losing their jobs because of machines, and this is just one of a dozen or more fields where men are becoming obsolete if they don't receive special training. I think our first responsibility is to the American people. Perhaps the American people should have something to say about this proposed bill, after all we will be paying for it. I think they would rather send their sons and daughters to college with those taxes than send someone they don't know. I feel we should help those who helped us in the past, namely the ex GI out of work, the fathers and mothers who gave sons to die for our country, etc. If we make this a business of wholesale giveaway, then it will lose its prestige to those who worked hard to earn it.

Not only are these men of the brigade being considered for such payments for fighting for their country, Cuba, but they are receiving well over a \$100 a month for living expenses. Do the unemployed in our country receive that much money when they are out of work, I think not. Even those Cubans who are at present in the armed services of the United States are receiving special treatment. Not long ago they were removed from Fort Knox, Ky., to the south because of the severe weather. If these men cannot stand all climates of weather what good will they be to the United States if we have to fight a future war in Russia. Our GI's have fought all over the world in all extremes of weather. Are these men going to be able to rest out their days in the sunny south. What would have happened if George Washington, that winter in Valley Forge, had taken his army and run off to Mexico or someplace else. I think Americans learned long ago that nothing is won by running, so why do the Cubans leave their homeland by the thousands. Perhaps if these men want lessons, they should take a course in American history. It could teach them many things. I could continue on and on, such as why the brigade leaders called the President of the United States a liar concerning the air cover story. Possibly they never heard the old saying, "don't look a gift horse in the mouth."

Let me state here that I don't dislike the Cuban people, nor am I criticizing my Government or its elected officials. I only want to know why the Cuban people are receiving preferential treatment when, I feel, that there are more deserving Americans. I think we should help these people to a reasonable extent. But I think the benefits mentioned are beyond reason. Our country is open to all peoples of the world as it should be, but why can't the Cuban people wait their turn as other peoples of other countries are doing. I don't feel we owe the people of Cuba anymore than the people of other countries.

I feel this matter should be taken before the American people. Abe Lincoln once said the Government was for the people and by the people. How are you going to know what the people want unless you ask them.

I would appreciate hearing an opinion from each of you gentlemen. Thank you for your time, and hoping to hear from you soon. I remain,

Sincerely,

DON L. THOMPSON.

New Civil Rights Organization Formed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the field of civil rights is a vast one, and it requires a great deal of original work and study. Up to now, the American Civil Liberties Union of New York, with local branches in many States, has pretty much had this field to itself. During the past years, I have often had the occasion both to defend and to criticize this organization and its work. I have done this in the spirit of caring a great deal about the men and women whose fates hang upon the work done by American Civil Liberties Union and its opponents. I have had numerous RECORD items about American Civil Liberties Union and its projects. Last year I was honored to meet with the board of directors of American Civil Liberties Union, to share some rather frank thoughts with them. A new organization has sprung up called the Defenders of American Liberties. It will seek to handle cases which American Civil Liberties Union for its own reasons does not want to work with, or where limited funds allow only one organization to be active. Clearly the makeup of both organizations and their personnel is very different. This should not disturb people. Competition between a more conservative and liberal point of view in the civil rights field should help bring out new issues and assist thoughtful citizens in doing more in this field. The Newhouse newspapers story—St. Louis Globe-Democrat—and the Christian Science Monitor report of December 31, 1962, and January 2, 1963, respectively, follow:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat,
Dec. 31, 1962]

MORRIS OUTLINES CIVIL RIGHTS FIGHT FOR
CONSERVATIVES

DALLAS.—Two sparsely furnished rooms in a Dallas skyscraper are headquarters for an organization whose president says it is fighting for the civil rights of conservative Americans—and filling a vacuum by doing so.

The new organization is Defenders of American Liberties. Its president is Robert Morris, attorney, former New York City judge, former counsel to congressional investigating committees, and former president of the University of Dallas.

In 1960, Morris, then a Point Pleasant attorney, ran for the Republican Senate nomination in the New Jersey primary, but was defeated by Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE.

LIMIT CASES

Morris said the organization will not take any case in which a meritorious civil rights issue is not involved, and in any such case it limits its action to the cause of civil rights.

He said Defenders of American Liberties is looking for this kind of man in trouble: "A poor guy who is not a member of any particular organization, has no pressure group behind him—and, say, he's losing his farm because of a tax debt."

In fact, Defenders believes just such a man is L. R. Gajewski, a Mitchell, N. Dak., farmer.